

## **Attachment B**

### **Planning Commission Discussion Issues**

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<b>Issues Identified for Consideration in Scope of Update</b>		
<p>S1. Where and to what degree are residential development and hotels greater than 6 stories in height appropriate in the mixed-use core? (Parnell, 5/10/06)</p> <p>Should policies speak to concept of proportionality between building height and roadway width? (Parnell, 6/27/07)</p> <p>How are the cities of Redmond and Bellevue coordinating on the consideration of additional height? (McCarthy, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>Buildings greater than 6 stories in height could be located in a number of places within Overlake Village, but particularly on the 3 “cornerstone” sites (Sears, Group Health, and PS Business Parks), where there is a need for larger public facilities such as regional stormwater management facilities, or a public park. Additional height above 6 stories is proposed as a bonus for the dedication of land for public facilities. Additional height is also proposed as an incentive for a variety of other amenities such as underground parking or green building techniques.</p> <p>Incentives could be combined to achieve a building height of up to 8 or 9 stories. Along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, however, building height is recommended to be limited to 6 stories based on the desired pedestrian character for that corridor.</p> <p>Staff does not recommend adding additional policy or regulation language related to the concept of building proportionality to street width. This issue was considered in the development of the proposed development regulations and design guidelines and is reflected in the proposal. Staff is concerned that adding such a concept might create a negative incentive for very wide private streets to be developed on sites in the area to allow for more proportionality between the buildings and street width.</p> <p>The City of Bellevue is also considering allowing building height above 6 stories in the Bel-Red Corridor but is at an earlier stage in the public process. Bellevue is currently conducting a public views analysis; Redmond has provided Bellevue staff with information on projected redevelopment sites and building heights.</p>	Closed.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners supported allowing building heights up to 8 or 9 stories in Overlake Village (9 for cornerstone sites) through the bonus incentive program. They further supported requiring along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE that buildings taller than 6 stories step-back floors 7 and higher. See Issue G3 for the Commission's discussion of the Group Health request with respect to building heights.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised. The majority of the Commission agreed that existing and proposed standards are sufficient to ensure a rough proportionality between building height and public streets. One Commissioner expressed a preference for wider streets when buildings are taller.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>In Fall 2006, the public weighed in on this issue at the November Open House, online, and through a series of focus groups and one-on-one stakeholder meetings. Out of 33 respondents, 24 people supported allowing buildings higher than 6 stories in Overlake Village, 8 did not support the concept, and 1 was unsure. The most common heights supported were in the 8-12 story range.</p> <p>A related question was posed to the public at the March 2007 Open House: should incentives be aggregated up to a maximum of 3 additional floors or should a maximum of 1 additional floor be offered for proposed amenities? Out of 11 responses, 7 supported aggregating incentives (for a total of up to 8 stories), 4 supported limiting incentives to 1 additional floor (for a total of up to 6 stories), and 2 had other comments.</p> <p>Written comment for public hearing included support for taller buildings to free up space for parks and traffic solutions; taller buildings should</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>S2. Where are there opportunities for “true” mixed-use buildings (retail/office and residential in one building)? (Parnell, 5/10/06)</p> <p>Do we see mixed-use redevelopment occurring in the foreseeable future? Is there market support for this type of development? (Snodgrass, 6/20/07)</p> <p>Are mixed-use developments in Mercer Island and Kirkland succeeding? Are there examples of horizontal mixed-use developments in the area? (Petitpas, 6/20/07)</p>	<p>have multi-story parking structures. (Patrick and Fay Cawley)</p> <p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Feedback from the development community indicates that achieving housing, retail and office in one building is not always desirable or the most financially feasible approach. Given the relatively large parcel sizes in Overlake, staff’s recommendation in general is to require retail or other commercial on the ground floor of buildings located along the arterials and for the remaining area to provide flexibility to achieve horizontal mix of uses across the site (i.e., buildings could be 100% residential or office). The update also proposes requiring a minimum residential component for any new development; throughout much of Overlake Village the minimum would be 50% of a project’s floor area. In the 3 areas identified as having a “regional retail or commercial” focus (generally where Sears, Safeway, and Exotic Motors are located), the minimum would be 25% of a project’s floor area.</p> <p>Anecdotally, the developments in Mercer Island and Kirkland appear to be successful and doing well. Horizontally mixed-use developments are occurring in Kent and Mill Creek.</p> <p>John Owen of Makers Architecture shared with the Commission that mixed-use mid-rise development is currently a very popular development type throughout the region.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners discussed the allowance of vertical and horizontal mixed-use development in Overlake and noted the flexibility that it provides developers and also noted that it allows for mixes of uses to be phased in over time.</p> <p>The Commissioners expressed support for the proposed minimum residential requirement as a method to achieve the vision and agreed the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Public Comments (if any)</u>	
S3. What is the estimated market demand for additional lodging in the area? (Parnell, Hinman 5/10/06)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The existing Silver Cloud Inn is generally 80-100% full during the week. The Silver Cloud Inn manager estimates that 80% of its business is associated with Microsoft. Currently, there is interest in building a new hotel within Overlake Village and Group Health representatives believe a hotel could be a key component of redevelopment of that site.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	Closed.
S4. What are the opportunities for additional services in the area, such as real estate firms, attorneys or catering services? (Parnell 5/10/06)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Additional services, such as real estate firms and attorneys are currently permitted uses in Overlake Village and are intended to remain in the area over time. As redevelopment of the area occurs, there could be more opportunity for these services to locate here. Those services that generate pedestrian traffic, such as mail posts, travel agencies and copy centers are encouraged to locate along 152<sup>nd</sup> to help activate the street.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that this topic would likely be addressed through discussions related to permitted uses in Overlake Village and that the information provided answered the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	Closed.
S5. How can the City prevent small businesses from being dislocated or	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> One way of helping to retain small businesses is for new developments</p>	Closed.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>“priced out of” the area when redevelopment occurs? Should and can the international businesses serve as an identity for the area? (Petitpas, Kumar 7/12/06)</p>	<p>to offer below-market rents to these existing businesses. The proposed update includes the incentive of additional commercial floor area (on a square-foot to square-foot basis) up to a maximum FAR of 0.55 and up to 1 additional floor if a minimum of 10% of a development’s retail floor area is offered at rents 25% below market rates.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners noted that the first question in this issue is likely to be addressed through discussion of permitted uses in Overlake Village. Most Commissioners expressed support for general statements in the policies suggesting that international businesses could provide an identity for the area.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> At the public design workshop in May 2006, many participants suggested that Overlake Village’s identity could be based on the many international businesses in the area. In addition, the high-tech nature of many other businesses provides an additional identity aspect. This identity could be reflected through urban design, streetscape improvements such as banners, or other methods.</p>	
<p>S6. How can affordable housing needs be met? (Kumar, 5/10/06)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The proposed update includes a requirement that 10% of new residential development with 10 or more units in Overlake be affordable to households earning 80% or less of the King County median income. A bonus of equal residential floor area is included to minimize or eliminate cost.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the proposed update to the affordable housing regulations addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>S7. How will SR 520 improvements affect the area? What can the City do to influence SR 520 planning to support the vision for Overlake? (McCarthy, 7/12/06)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The proposed update includes policy support for continued cooperative work with other stakeholders and regional agencies in identifying improvements for SR 520. City staff has met with staff from Bellevue, WSDOT and other stakeholders in the area on identification of needs and opportunities in this area. As this planning takes place, additional analysis will be done to determine how improvements to SR 520 will affect Overlake.</p> <p>The Draft SEIS for Overlake includes under both alternatives completion of improvements to SR 520 between I-5 and Bellevue Way by 2030, and for the Action Alternative, study, design and construction of improvements to the SR 520 corridor between I-405 and SR 202.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners considered further information provided by staff related to the potential impact of SR 520 improvements west of I-405 and potential tolling on Overlake, and agreed that the information provided addressed the questions.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>S8. Opportunities to encourage the City of Bellevue to support an additional SR 520 interchange in the vicinity of 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, in addition to the improvements Bellevue is supporting at 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE? (Parnell, 5/30/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> In the late 1990s/early 2000, Bellevue studied a possible new interchange on SR 520 at 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. The study found that such an interchange is unfeasible given costs and the concerns of the Bridle Trails neighborhood. Bellevue is proposing to complete the half-interchange on SR 520 at 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE as part of the Bel-Red Corridor project; these improvements are not yet funded or included on WSDOT project lists.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>S9. What are the transportation needs of the area given the projected growth in population and jobs, and how they can be met? (Querry, Kumar, 5/10/06)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Overlake has a variety of transportation needs, including non-motorized, roadway, and transit. The proposed update includes a significant number of non-motorized improvements to enhance the pedestrian and bicycle systems. Roadway projects include intersection improvements to improve flow and movement through intersections, one roadway widening to provide additional capacity, and a number of new local street connections to improve local access and circulation in Overlake Village. Transit improvements include the addition of an arterial bus rapid transit route by Metro, a light rail line with 2 stations in Overlake, and improved local and regional bus service.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Comments from the public indicate that improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle systems are a top priority in the neighborhood (see results of November 2006 survey).</p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>S10. Will the constrained connections to the north limit the ability of 152nd Ave NE to serve as the community's focal core? If so, how can those constraints be overcome?</p> <p>What actions should be taken in order to create a pedestrian-oriented, mixed use main street? What is the</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The new NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge which will connect NE 36<sup>th</sup> and NE 31<sup>st</sup> Streets across SR 520 will improve connections between 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE and the northern and western portions of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Proposed improvements to 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE include the addition of bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and the potential for light rail and bus rapid transit, all of which could transform its character into something with a more "Main Street" feel. The update proposes to require pedestrian-</p>	<p>Closed.</p>



**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>preferred role of transit on 152nd Ave NE? (McCarthy, Snodgrass, 7/12/06)</p> <p>Can retail and services along the entirety of 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave NE be supported? How do we achieve successful retail along this street in the interim? (Petitpas, 6/27/07)</p>	<p>oriented uses on the ground floor along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE to help create a pedestrian-oriented, mixed use corridor. The portion of 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE north of NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street is a strong location for transit given the potential in the area for significant intensification of development over time, proximity to the park and ride, and relatively central location within the area. Approximately 15,500 employees are within walking distance (one-half mile) of the northern portion of 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE today. Under the proposed update, approximately 22,900 employees are projected to be within the same distance in 2030.</p> <p>Economic analysis of Overlake suggests that the neighborhood can support retail and services along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. A number of neighborhood services and retail would be necessary to support the residential portion of future redevelopment. These uses also help to provide people places for gathering that contribute to a successful community. The proposed update also allows for ground floor uses to be converted to retail and services over time: up to 50 percent of a project's ground floor uses can make use of this conversion provision. This requires that these spaces are built to meet the needs of retail and service uses.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners noted that there are a large number of employees within walking distance of the northern portion of the corridor which would help to support retail and services. The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>The public was asked in Spring 2007 whether it supported having new buildings along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE include pedestrian oriented uses. Out of 13 responses, 11 supported the concept, 1 was unsure, and 1 did not support it.</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>S11. How can parking be managed over time? (McCarthy, 7/12/06)</p> <p>Discuss proposed policy N-OV-43, related to cost of parking (Snodgrass, 6/13/07)</p> <p>Discuss parking facilities related to light rail transit, particularly at Overlake Transit Station (NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street) if the light rail line terminates there (McCarthy, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>The proposed update includes policy support for developing a parking management program for Overlake, as well as for monitoring the need for a residential parking permit program should parking demand from the Employment Area cause negative spillover effects in the Residential Area. In addition, the update includes policy support for reducing parking standards near transit stations over time as new transit stations in the area become active.</p> <p>Currently, a parking study is underway on Downtown Redmond; the results of this study will likely also provide insights on additional ways to manage parking in Overlake.</p> <p>Policy N-OV-43 related to the cost of parking is proposed for a number of reasons: it helps to reinforce and enforce existing Transportation Management Plans that the City has established with employers, and it provides a policy basis for employers to establish incentives related to parking that encourage the use of alternative modes. Parking fees have shown to make a significant difference in promoting alternative modes of travel and help parking facilities function more efficiently.</p> <p>Sound Transit is evaluating each East Link station as both a terminus and a through station in preparation for the project EIS to better understand the mitigation necessary in each location. The agency has agreements in place with other jurisdictions along the Link light rail line (such as Tukwila) to monitor the parking conditions on a regular basis. These agreements establish triggers that can result in additional enforcement, the addition of parking spaces, or the addition of transit service.</p> <p>Generally, it is better to have active land uses within the quarter-mile surrounding a transit station—active land uses such as office, retail or residential generate many more transit trips than does a park and ride</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>facility. Park and ride facilities within these circles create a “dead zone” for several hours during the day.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>  The Commissioners discussed whether paid on-street parking is a necessary concept to include in policy N-OV-43 and agreed it could help to manage supply and can be especially important on a retail street. Further, they reasoned that the plan is looking at the long-term and that consideration of paid parking would be at some time in the future. Some Commissioners expressed concern with monitoring or enforcement costs but noted that technology may reduce these costs in the future.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that a park-and-ride facility would not be appropriate on 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. They discussed what parking facilities might be appropriate at the NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street station if it were a temporary or permanent terminus for the East Link line. A majority of the Commissioners did not support additional parking at this location regardless of its status as a terminus or through station. The Commissioners agreed that this is a larger policy issue that can better be addressed once the extent of the East Link line is more certain. One Commissioner commented that the terminus may not be temporary and expressed concern about limiting the amount of parking that’s at this location.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
S12. Can we better connect the corporate campus area with the mixed use area to the south? If so, how?	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u>  Non-motorized improvements and new transit service will help to better connect the Employment Area with Overlake Village. Non-motorized</p>	Closed, with update to proposed policy

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
(Kumar, 7/12/06)	<p>improvements proposed in the update include completing missing sidewalk and bicycle lanes within the neighborhood, creating a multi-use pathway along 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and the addition of mid-block crossings on 152<sup>nd</sup> and 156<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE.</p> <p>Future transit service that can better connect these 2 areas include Metro's arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) route which would make frequent stops at stations located roughly ¼ mile apart along 148<sup>th</sup>, 40<sup>th</sup>, 156<sup>th</sup>, and potentially 152<sup>nd</sup>. This service could allow employees in the Employment Area to use a bus to reach restaurants, services, and retail opportunities in Overlake Village without needing a bus schedule. The future light rail line will feature 2 stations within Overlake: 1 in the heart of Overlake Village and 1 near NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street which will also provide an additional simple and quick transit connection between the 2 areas.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners discussed this issue in reviewing the proposed policies and agreed that the proposed updates address improved connections between the Employment Area and Overlake. They also agreed that improved connections between Overlake and Downtown Redmond are important and agreed to add a specific reference to the Downtown to proposed policy N-OV-28.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
S13. How can we improve pedestrian safety? Should there be any pedestrian only areas? (Kumar, 7/12/06)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Pedestrian safety within Overlake Village can be improved through streetscape improvements (providing landscape strips or tree wells between sidewalks and roadways), ensuring adequate sidewalk width, adding bike lanes and street parking to provide additional buffers for pedestrians, adding select mid-block crossings, and potentially grade-separating some pedestrian crossings of major arterials or routes, such</p>	Closed.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>as at 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and across SR 520. The proposed plan includes these strategies.</p> <p>At this time, staff is not proposing any pedestrian-only areas but foresees that these areas could be proposed as parts of future developments. A multi-use pathway is proposed in the vicinity of NE 26<sup>th</sup> Street that would create a non-motorized connection in a right-of-way separate from vehicles.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that staff's response addressed the issue. They also agreed to support the general language in proposed policy N-OV-33 (consider grade separations) rather than calling out specific locations in recognition that needs change over time and of potential funding limitations.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> A pedestrian-only overpass across SR 520 from the Overlake Transit Center to the west side of the freeway was identified as a top priority by the public in Fall 2006. A pedestrian-only overpass across 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE between NE 24<sup>th</sup> and NE 20<sup>th</sup> Streets was supported as a good idea in the same survey. Other pedestrian-oriented improvements were identified either as top priorities or good ideas.</p>	
<p>S14. From a neighborhood planning perspective, what is (are) the preferred type(s), alignment(s) and station location(s) for high capacity transit (HCT) and the role(s) of transit facilities in Overlake Village? (5/06 design workshop)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Two forms of HCT have been identified as serving Overlake in the future: bus rapid transit (BRT) and light rail (LRT). Metro's proposed route for the BRT line is to run from Downtown Redmond, south on 148<sup>th</sup>, east on 40<sup>th</sup>, and south on 156<sup>th</sup> to Crossroads. An alternative route supported by the public and City is to run south on 156<sup>th</sup>, west on 31<sup>st</sup>, south on 152<sup>nd</sup>, and then east on 24<sup>th</sup> back to 156<sup>th</sup> to continue on to Crossroads. Staff is currently pursuing this alternative with Metro.</p> <p>A number of alignments are proposed for light rail through Overlake</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Village, including along 20<sup>th</sup> turning up 152<sup>nd</sup>, behind Safeway turning up 152<sup>nd</sup>, and along 24<sup>th</sup> turning up 152<sup>nd</sup>. Staff supports a station location along 152<sup>nd</sup> in the vicinity of NE 24<sup>th</sup> so as to serve the largest possible population.</p> <p>Staff recommends that transit facilities within Overlake Village not provide large amounts of parking so as to attract trips from other areas. The parking at the existing Overlake Park and Ride along 152<sup>nd</sup> should not be increased. The City's Transportation Master Plan supports improving access to HCT facilities through complementary land use decisions as well as convenient and attractive pedestrian, bicycling and other transit connections.</p> <p>Staff has identified two options for how 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE would transition to accommodate light rail transit (LRT), which will require 30 feet of the right-of-way. The first option is to remove the median and on-street parking in locations where additional space is needed for LRT; the second option is to remove the median, bike lanes, and one side of the on-street parking where additional space is needed. Under the second option, the bicycle lanes would be moved to 151<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners supported a station location on 152<sup>nd</sup> just north of NE 24<sup>th</sup> so as to reach the largest possible population. They further agreed that a retained cut on 152<sup>nd</sup> for light rail could be problematic in trying to create a pedestrian-friendly corridor. The Commissioners noted that further design of 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE should look into options for accommodating bicyclists. Concerns were raised with regard to bicycle safety on 152<sup>nd</sup> and that 151<sup>st</sup> might function as an alley.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>The public was asked to identify a preferred light rail alignment through Overlake Village in Fall 2006. Out of 27 responses, 16 preferred 152<sup>nd</sup>, 7 preferred behind Safeway, and 4 preferred 151<sup>st</sup>, an alignment that is no longer under consideration. In the same survey, the public was asked to identify a preferred alignment for BRT through Overlake Village. Out of 30 responses, 17 preferred 152<sup>nd</sup> and 13 preferred that BRT remain on 156<sup>th</sup>.</p>	
<p>S15. How do transit services and facilities evolve prior to HCT development to serve the community and encourage development that builds HCT ridership? (5/06 design workshop)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>If Metro opts to run its BRT service on 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE through Overlake Village, this service could help build early ridership for a future light rail line. As a form of HCT, this service would also encourage development that could strengthen future light rail ridership.</p> <p>As part of Sound Transit's EIS process for ST2, the agency is focusing significant efforts on planning future transit service that would work to support the light rail line through Overlake.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>S16. Is it realistic to think of 152<sup>nd</sup> as not a primary through-traffic street like 148<sup>th</sup> or 156<sup>th</sup> in the future? (Parnell, 6/27/07)</p> <p>Has there been any consideration of moving the bicycle lanes inside of the on-street parking to increase the</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>Several transportation improvements that are planned or under consideration could reduce the volume of through-traffic on 152<sup>nd</sup> in the future. The NE 36<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge will provide an additional east-west connection across SR 520 which could accommodate a portion of the current users of NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street. Transportation modeling for the Final SEIS includes the evaluation of a slip ramp from SR 520 eastbound to the northern portion of 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, a project identified in the</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>feeling of safety for bicyclists? (Parnell, 6/27/07)</p> <p>Could on-street parking be angled on 152<sup>nd</sup>? (Snodgrass, 7/11/07)</p>	<p>BROTS North-South study. The slip ramp could provide access from SR 520 to NE 31<sup>st</sup> Street and 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE without requiring the use of 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue, NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street, or 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE.</p> <p>152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE is currently a lower volume street than the surrounding arterials. The landscaped median planned for this corridor, in addition to slightly more narrow lanes, will provide traffic calming. Other traffic calming devices could be evaluated in the future as necessary—additional measures will have to be carefully balanced with the goal of using 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE as an alignment for a bus rapid transit line.</p> <p>The placement of bicycle lanes is governed by national standards to locate these facilities most safely. Locating bicycle lanes inside on-street parking generates a number of safety concerns for bicyclists, particularly at intersections and driveways. Staff noted that it may be difficult to move bicycle lanes to this location given that many improvements to 152<sup>nd</sup> will be made incrementally as redevelopment occurs.</p> <p>Angled parking has not been considered on 152<sup>nd</sup> for a number of reasons: it creates safety issues for cyclists and given the existing and future traffic volumes on the corridor, it could result in increased conflicts with moving vehicles.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners discussed concerns that traffic on 152<sup>nd</sup> could become worse in the future or with the NE 36<sup>th</sup> Bridge connection across SR 520.</p> <p>Commissioner Parnell noted that his main concern is the provision of a safe way for cyclists to get from the future light rail station on 152<sup>nd</sup> to the SR 520 bike trail and was satisfied that the urban pathway along the</p>	



**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>NE 26<sup>th</sup> Street alignment and improvements to non-motorized facilities on 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE would provide this connection.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> The public identified 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE as a linear neighborhood core for Overlake Village at the May 2006 design workshop. The linear neighborhood would have more of a “Main Street” feel and be pedestrian friendly.</p>	
<b>Policy Issues</b>		
<p>P1. How have convenience commercial and service uses in the Employment Area been treated in the proposed update? Are they more limited? Should limitations on these uses described in the regulations be reflected in the policies? (Snodgrass email 6/5/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The intent of old policy N-OV-19, which supported permitting convenience commercial and service uses in the Overlake Business and Advanced Technology zone, has been maintained in new policy N-OV-70. The new policy clarifies the intent of the previous policy, which is that these uses primarily serve employees and nearby residents of the area. Similar to the Willows/Rose Hill plan, these uses are now defined more broadly in the associated proposed Overlake regulations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commission supported proposed policy N-OV-70 and this approach.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>P2. Is it feasible to ensure that new improvements provide a pedestrian supportive environment? (proposed N-OV-31)</p> <p>Should the policies address</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> While pedestrian supportive is the design standard in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), there are locations or instances where this standard is not feasible. However, staff recommends keeping pedestrian supportive as the design standard since it’s adopted in the TMP and existing codes provide the flexibility to meet the intent but adjust the</p>	<p>Closed with update to proposed policy.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
pedestrian uses in specific areas, such as those designated “friendly,” or “tolerant?” (Snodgrass, email 6/5/07)	<p>standard when needed. Further, this standard is a reasonable goal that the City can make progress toward over time.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners supported this approach with the addition of a reference to the TMP in N-OV-31.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>P3. The “Green Streets” concept has been deleted from the proposed policies. Is this deletion appropriate? (Snodgrass, email 6/5/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The “Green Streets,” “Neighborhood Protection Streets,” and “Boulevards” concepts have been replaced by a street classification system and associated cross-sections contained in the proposed Overlake regulations. This approach is similar to that taken in the Downtown Plan. These concepts were proving difficult to administer and implement; the street classification system is more straight-forward.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners supported the proposed approach.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	Closed.
<p>P4. How can gateways in Overlake and to the City (new policies N-OV-16 and 17) be encouraged given that specific gateways were not endorsed by City Council? (Petitpas, email 6/6/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Gateways could be identified through individual neighborhood plans, which provide significant public comment opportunities. In the case of Overlake, participants supported the concept of neighborhood gateways that contribute to the creation of a sense of place.</p> <p>Enhancements to these gateways are intended to be integrated as part of other improvements, such as transportation projects or potential future regional stormwater improvements near 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street.</p>	Closed.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that identification of gateways is especially important for Overlake given the ambiguity in the boundaries between Redmond and Bellevue and the community interest in enhancing Overlake's identity. They supported the policies as proposed.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Participants at the Design Charrette in May 2006 supported the concept of gateways that contribute to the creation of a sense of place in Overlake. The survey at the March 2007 open house and the follow-up survey online included a question asking whether 4 particular locations should be a gateway: 7 people supported both 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE at NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street at Bel-Red Road; 3 people supported either NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street at Bel-Red Road or had other suggestions; and, 4 people supported NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street at 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE as a gateway location.</p>	
<p>P5. New N-OV-29 proposes a 40% daily mode-split by 2030. How do we achieve this if there is no light rail service? (Petitpas, email 6/6/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The goal may not be achievable without light rail transit; improvements to transportation facilities and services is one of the triggers proposed in policy N-OV-9 for the consideration of allowing increased capacity in the Employment Area.</p> <p>However, improvements in mode split can be made by any combination of the use of carpooling, vanpooling, walking, biking, or using transit. In the case of Overlake, there are a variety of transit types: local bus service, regional bus service, regional express bus service, and a future bus rapid transit (BRT) route connecting Downtown Redmond with Downtown Bellevue via Overlake and Crossroads. The BRT route will be operational by King County Metro by 2011. A majority of the transportation improvement projects proposed with this update are non-motorized in nature to improve the pedestrian and bicycle environments.</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Staff is revising this policy to propose a 40% <u>peak-hour</u> mode-split by 2030. This is more consistent with the data that is kept and analyzed both by the City and by regional bodies such as the Puget Sound Regional Council. Current daily mode-split information is not maintained by the City, but the daily mode-split in Overlake in 1993 was 18% and the Comprehensive Plan sets a daily mode-split goal for the neighborhood of 30% (Transportation Element Table TR-2). The TMP sets a Citywide peak-period mode-split goal for 2022 of 30%. The existing Overlake peak-period mode-split is estimated to be approximately 15%. This does not include trips by walking, bicycling or those who work at home.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>P6. How should the single-family residential portion of Overlake be covered relative to issues typically addressed through neighborhood plan updates (such as design standards, cottage housing, and opportunities for neighborhood commercial) since it has not been addressed much as part of this process? (McCarthy, 5/23/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Residents from the single-family residential portion of the Residential Area of Overlake will be invited to participate in the Viewpoint Neighborhood Plan process. The Citizens Advisory Committee for this plan will include three members from this area of Overlake.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commission supported this approach.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>P7. Policy N-OV-75, referring to parks west of SR 520 and east of SR 520, south of NE 40<sup>th</sup>. (Microsoft, 6/13/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The proposed policy carries forward concepts from the 1999 plan for additional special use parks in the area. The generalized locations shown in the 1999 plan are not on Microsoft property. However, the</p>	<p>Closed with update to proposed policy.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>locations are intended to be vicinities and the City seeks opportunities for these kinds of spaces through provisions such as development agreements.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commission discussed the benefits of more generally referencing the parks identified in the PRO Plan, noting that this approach allows for greater flexibility and reduces the risk of creating inconsistencies between the Comprehensive Plan and the PRO Plan. The Commissioners recommended removing language in Policy N-OV-75 related to the type and location of parks within the Employment Area of Overlake. Commissioners supported adding a reference to the type of parks to be developed here to the text preceding the policy.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Asking if parks contemplated in the policy are intended for Microsoft property. If yes, objects due to concerns about risk and liability issues.</p>	
<p>P8. Timing for Redmond's action on Phase 1 amendments for Overlake Neighborhood Plan update and implementation project. (City of Bellevue staff, 5/30/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Redmond began the Overlake Update and Implementation project in 2005 in large to identify actions needed to support implementation of the adopted vision and begin work needed to extend the planning horizon to 2030, in support of the City of Bellevue's planning project for the Bel-Red Corridor.</p> <p>The Phase 1 policy and regulatory amendments under consideration by the Planning Commission do not change the existing BROTS agreement and the City of Redmond maintains its commitment to the commercial development cap in that agreement. Both cities have committed to undertake the work needed to update the existing agreement and provide for phasing of growth and transportation improvements.</p> <p>Since beginning the project in 2005, staff from the two cities have updated each other and key groups on concepts under consideration,</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>schedules and anticipated products. The Bellevue and Redmond City Councils met late last year for a joint briefing on the project. Redmond has undertaken significant effort to inform and seek input from people in the area on the update and the future of the area. Redmond's Planning Commission, City Council and Mayor have also been active participants throughout the process. A delay would have a significant adverse impact on Redmond's ability to complete the proposed Phase 1 amendments.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners noted that Bellevue and Redmond have both committed to further coordination on growth phasing and transportation needs. The Commission supported proceeding with Phase 1 amendments.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Maintains that Redmond's process should be slowed down to a point that allows for the two cities' planned land use and transportation reconciliation process to take place. No policy or code changes related to changes in overall land use capacity, including direct or indirect conclusions about the amount of land use to accommodate, building FARs, building height or other dimensional specifics should be put in place in policy or code by either city until the joint reconciliation process has occurred. To do so would take key parameters off the table that need to be in place for a full reconciliation. Until more joint work is conducted, the impacts of the combined land use forecasts are not known.</p>	
<p>P9. Policy N-OV-9, Consider allowing development capacity of up to 19.9 million square feet of retail, office and manufacturing uses through the year 2030, and consider phasing increases in non-residential</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The proposed policy is based on project work since 2005 and analysis in the Draft SEIS. The purpose is to indicate the amount of non-residential development for consideration through 2030 while also specifying the general triggers that would be necessary for the City to consider allowing an increase in development capacity in the Employment Area.</p>	<p>Closed with update to proposed policy.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																					
development capacity in the Employment Area by linking increases to improvements in transportation facilities or services, increased residential development in Overlake, or the adequacy of parks, emergency services and other services needed for a daytime population. (Snodgrass, 6/13/07)	<p>Further definition related to this policy is proposed as an outcome of the joint Bellevue-Redmond work on phasing of growth and transportation improvements within Bel-Red and Overlake.</p> <p>Staff proposes changes to policy language consistent with Planning Commissioners’ request:</p> <p>Consider allowing a total development capacity of up to 19.9 million square feet of retail, office, research and development, and manufacturing uses within the Overlake Neighborhood through the year 2030. <u>Phase Consider</u> <del>Consider phasing</del> increases in non-residential development capacity in the Overlake Business and Advanced Technology zone over time by linking increases to improvements to transportation facilities or services, increased residential development in Overlake, <u>and</u> <del>or</del> the adequacy of parks, emergency services and other services needed for a daytime population.</p> <p>The proposed 2030 development capacity is fitting with Redmond’s policy related to having an appropriate mix of housing and jobs (FW-9). As shown in the table below, the combined projections of housing and commercial growth in Overlake for 2030 would improve the jobs/housing balance in the neighborhood and bring it closer to that for the City overall.</p> <p>Estimated Jobs, Population:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Overlake</td><td colspan="3">Citywide</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Jobs</td><td>Pop</td><td>Jobs/ Resident</td><td>Jobs</td><td>Pop</td><td>Jobs/ Resident</td></tr><tr><td>2005 (existing and pipeline)</td><td>54,787</td><td>6,445</td><td>8.5</td><td>80,695</td><td>50,674</td><td>1.59</td></tr></table>		Overlake			Citywide				Jobs	Pop	Jobs/ Resident	Jobs	Pop	Jobs/ Resident	2005 (existing and pipeline)	54,787	6,445	8.5	80,695	50,674	1.59	
	Overlake			Citywide																			
	Jobs	Pop	Jobs/ Resident	Jobs	Pop	Jobs/ Resident																	
2005 (existing and pipeline)	54,787	6,445	8.5	80,695	50,674	1.59																	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes							Status
	Adopted 2022 job and population targets for City with potential allocation for Overlake	56,963	10,405	5.4	106,000	65,700	1.61	
	2030 for Overlake update	73,626	18,895	3.9	128,579	83,577	1.54	
	<p>Notes: Job estimates are updated by using square feet/job estimates per sector rather than a Citywide square foot per job to account for the high proportion of office jobs in Overlake and greater job density. Population is based on estimated Citywide average of people per household. 2005 is based on commercial square feet and number of dwellings for Overlake and Citywide, not specific counts.</p> <p>The City adopts job and population targets at a Citywide level only, recognizing that the amount of growth in any neighborhood is affected by market decisions.</p> <p>The 2022 adopted job/housing targets were created with the recognition of the existing BROTS cap on commercial development in Overlake and provided the impetus for directing staff to reexamine the future of the cap. Although the development capacity proposed for consideration through 2030 for Overlake would result in job growth beyond the target currently adopted, it represents a lower level of annual growth than has occurred in Overlake in past: the proposed capacity would annualize to roughly 228,929 square feet per year between 2010 and 2030 or 457,858</p>							



**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>per year between 2020 and 2030, compared to past trends of 841,000 square feet per year in existing plus pipeline between 1995 and 2005. Decisions regarding phasing of any increases to zoning capacity in the Employment Area, including whether to update Redmond's 2022 job target, would be an outcome of Redmond's continued coordination with the City of Bellevue regarding phasing of growth and transportation improvements in the Bel-Red and Overlake areas.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners agreed upon the importance of linking development capacity increases to triggers such as transit and transportation improvements or residential development. Staff to revise policy language to strengthen the linkage concept. Asked staff to provide information on how the 19.9 million square foot capacity fits with policies related to jobs-housing balance.</p> <p>Commissioners supported the proposed revisions to the policy language. Agreed that a regulation related to phasing is unnecessary as part of Phase 1, as commercial development capacity is capped through the BROTS agreement and increasing the development capacity in the Employment Area would require amending the allowed FAR established in the Development Guide, but will address this further in Phase 2. Supported adding a reference to Policy FW-9 to the proposed policy language. Asked staff to provide information on the number of jobs projected for 2022.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the relationship between Phase 1 action and the adopted 2022 job/housing target and was satisfied that action on Phase 1 proposed amendments would not be in conflict with the adopted targets.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> One written comment for public hearing expressing opposition to Microsoft intrusions and costly road construction for their employee automobiles. No changes north of SR 520. (Herb Bentley)</p>	
<p>P10. Old N-OV-10 specifies improved access to shopping; new N-OV-28 has no mention of access to shopping. (Snodgrass, email 6/5/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> New N-OV-66 is intended to address this issue as it calls for improving local street access and circulation in Overlake Village by expanding the street grid. Although it does not expressly mention shopping, it would contribute to improving access to all uses in Overlake Village.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>P11. Does new N-OV-8 provide enough policy guidance on when deliveries and outdoor maintenance activities can take place in order to reduce adverse impacts to nearby residential uses? (Snodgrass, email 6/5/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff believes the new N-OV-8 provides enough policy guidance on ways to reduce or avoid adverse impacts from commercial uses on nearby residential uses. Many of the specifics contained in some of the old Overlake policies are addressed in the development regulations, where they are a better fit.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>P12. Old N-OV-49 describing the general design concept for Overlake Village has been deleted. Is this</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> New N-OV-49 contains similar concepts as the old N-OV-49 which describes the general design concept for Overlake Village. Specific</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
deletion appropriate? (Snodgrass, email 6/5/07)	<p>urban design concepts are contained in the proposed development regulations. New N-OV-57 through -59 also contain design concepts.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
P13. Old N-OV-50 establishing the housing emphasis area has been deleted. Why are we eliminating the housing emphasis area? (Snodgrass, email 6/5/07)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The Housing Emphasis Area could be considered a “reverse regulation” in that its primary purpose was to specify where regional retail was <u>not</u> allowed. Instead, we are continuing to emphasize housing throughout Overlake Village through a proposed requirement that 50 percent (or 25 percent in areas that are identified as having more of a commercial focus) of a project’s developed floor area be maintained as residential use. Regional retail uses are desired in the areas where Sears is generally located now.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	Closed.
P14. Should new N-OV-14, which speaks to flexible regulations, apply to the Residential Area as well? (Petitpas, email 6/6/07)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Existing Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) provisions provide some opportunity for flexibility within residential areas. N-OV-14 provides the policy basis for the same kind of ADF that exists for the Downtown and is more encompassing. Staff recommends that these provisions be limited to the Employment Area and Overlake Village.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p>	Closed.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>P15. Appropriate lighting is related to N-OV-24, -32, and -74 as a design feature but is primarily a safety measure. (Petitpas, email 6/6/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Each of these policies deals primarily with urban design of public places or pedestrian connections. Citywide lighting standards would apply to any of these developments.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>P16. Convenience commercial uses should be linked to employment and residential uses with sidewalks and bike paths. (Petitpas, email, 6/6/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> A reference to “bicycle access” can be added to policy N-OV-71.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners supported the policy revision.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed with revision to policy.</p>
<p>P17. Boundary for Overlake and Viewpoint Neighborhoods</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The Viewpoint area was combined with the Overlake area as part of the 1999 Overlake Neighborhood Plan update. As part of the City’s Comprehensive Plan amendment docketing process starting in 2005, creation of a Viewpoint Neighborhood Plan and Development Guide provisions was included as a specific proposal. This proposal was reviewed at Planning Commission and City Council meetings in 2005 and 2006 as part of the City’s annual docketing process. The reasoning was to develop a neighborhood plan specific to Viewpoint that</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>addresses the area’s particular character and topics of interest. Due to Viewpoint’s location on Lake Sammamish and primarily single-family land uses, it is very different in character from the predominantly non-residential character of the Overlake area. Restoring Viewpoint as a specific neighborhood planning area is also consistent with Redmond’s Transportation Management District boundaries. For purposes of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan update, staff used W Lake Sammamish Parkway and Bel-Red Road as the western edge of Viewpoint.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners supported the proposed amendment to neighborhood boundaries, commenting that the updated boundary makes sense.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Proposed map changes were not adequately depicted in notice materials and pre-suppose the map amendment. Maps included with the notice materials already excluded Viewpoint.</p>	
<b>Regulatory Issues</b>		
<p>R1. Consideration of permitting advanced technology, research and development, and associated uses as allowed uses in current RC (future Overlake Village) zone. (PS Business Parks representatives, KCC Limited Edition representatives, 5/30/07 – 6/13/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> During the project, staff reviewed the permitted uses in Overlake Village. Many of the permitted uses support the vision of Overlake Village as evolving into a true, urban residential/mixed-use place. The uses are largely pedestrian-generating or –oriented in nature to help increase the vibrancy and economic vitality of the area and include a variety of retail, service and entertainment uses, as well as multi-family residential.</p> <p>Advanced technology and business service uses are currently permitted in three zones in the City—Business Park (BP), Manufacturing Park (MP), and Overlake Business and Advanced Technology (OBAT)—as well as within the Downtown Districts which together account for 86 percent of the commercial or mixed-use zones in the City. Allowing</p>	<p>Closed with revisions to code language.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>these uses in Overlake Village would add pressure to one of the few areas that does not allow advanced technology, research and development, and similar business consulting services.</p> <p>Expanding the allowed uses in Overlake Village to permit these businesses could further delay redevelopment of the area and achievement of the vision. Allowing such uses to locate in this area as of right would create “going concerns” in the long-term and further delay the addition of residential uses, a key concept in the long-term vision for Overlake. These uses were intentionally included in the OBAT zone to focus them in this location and not permitted in the RC zone. Over the past 15 years, job opportunities in Redmond have grown significantly but housing opportunities have not kept pace.</p> <p>An alternative that staff is proposing is to allow expansion of permitted uses as part of the incentive program. Allowing additional uses in this case would not hinder the achievement of the vision for Overlake Village as a minimum amount of residential floor area is required for any redevelopment that occurs. Additional uses such as advanced technology or business consulting services could locate in upper story offices on redeveloped sites along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE and anywhere within buildings located elsewhere in Overlake Village.</p> <p>Staff provided an overview of the zoning history for the area, and the variety of service uses that are permitted in addition to retail uses. Regarding the Limited Edition property, the majority of the businesses on the property conform to permitted uses.</p> <p>Staff recommends a three-pronged approach to this request:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain existing businesses and transition non-conforming businesses over time to those that conform. All currently licensed businesses, regardless of use would be allowed to remain. Businesses that are a BP-type use could stay as long as</li> </ol>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>they choose, but could not expand. Once a BP use leaves, it can be replaced with a similar BP use if it conformed to the zoning prior to 1999 but if it did not conform prior to 1999 it would need to be replaced with a conforming use. Propose to codify this approach for Overlake now and codify for the City as a whole after adoption.</p> <p>2. Maintain BP and Advanced Technology uses in other city zones. Allowing these uses of-right in Overlake Village conflicts with the need to maintain space in the City for retail and service uses that serve the general public and the adopted policy for the area encouraging redevelopment and the addition of housing. Staff supports the allowance for these uses as part of the incentive program to achieve multiple goals.</p> <p>3. Take additional steps to attract uses that conform to zoning. Staff proposes to work in partnership with the private sector to attract conforming uses, including assisting with communication of the area's strengths. Further suggest clarifying the proposed use chart and associated descriptions of uses to improve private sector understanding of zoning. The City can further co-sponsor communication on goals for Overlake with the private sector as part of an Overlake marketing and communication strategy.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners supported the approach to grandfathering in existing businesses recommended by staff. They further supported staff's recommendation to maintain the permitted uses as proposed but to allow additional uses as part of the proposed Bonus Incentive Program. The Commissioners supported this recommendation for several reasons: the grandfathering provisions enable current businesses to stay while also enabling transition over time, it's a more flexible approach than the City's existing nonconforming use standards, more land in Redmond is zoned for advanced technology and business park uses than for service and retail businesses that serve the general public,</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>and that the City’s decision on this issue needs to consider the area’s long-term, not just short-term future and the community’s needs and interests as a whole. The Commissioners also noted that there is an imbalance of high tech uses in Overlake now and that the time to consider allowing more is when there is progress made on other adopted objectives for the area. The Commissioners also noted with respect to the PS Business Parks request for expanded uses that the company was well aware of the adopted zoning and policies prior to purchase of the former Yett property. One Commissioner expressed concern that when properties are redeveloped that they have a wide enough range of uses to be economically successful and in responses, requested that staff propose more opportunities within the proposed Bonus Incentive Program to offer additional uses as an incentive. Requested that staff clarify definitions of uses preceding and within the proposed permitted uses table. In the course of this discussion, the Commission also agreed on changes to proposed policy N-OV-52 to promote Overlake as a vibrant place to live, work and recreate rather than as a “destination”.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>In response to the Draft SEIS published in March 2007, representatives of PS Business Parks requested that staff consider expanding the allowed uses in the RC zone where one of their properties, the Overlake Business Center, is located. They requested an expansion of uses to allow for higher economic return in the short-term.</p> <p>Several owners/occupants of the KCC Limited Edition property and two other representatives for the property have asked that uses be expanded to allow business park type tenants. They commented that the property is not attractive for the types of uses that are currently permitted, and that they are concerned about the impact of the current zoning on their ability to either sell the property or lease it to another business.</p>	
R2.Request to allow higher FAR (1.25-1.5) for hotel uses in RC (proposed	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>Three hotels and one motel have been built to-date in the City of</p>	Closed.



**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																
<p>Overlake Village) zone. (Austin Khan, OTO Development; Public Hearing 5/30/07)</p> <p>Why treat hotels differently in Overlake Village? (Querry, 8/15/07)</p> <p>Could a developer of a larger site parcel off the hotel, so as to use the maximum allowed hotel FAR and the maximum allowed non-hotel commercial FAR? (Snodgrass, 8/15/07)</p> <p>Request to apply the higher hotel FAR to the Overlake Design District as well. (Larry Martin, Group Health representative, 8/22/07)</p>	<p>Redmond and each is developed to a higher FAR than that currently allowed in the RC (proposed OV) zone. The Silver Cloud Inn, an existing hotel in the Overlake Village area, is built to an FAR of 0.93.</p> <p>Staff proposes creating a separate FAR of 1.2 for hotel uses in the Overlake Village (OV) zone. This is the average FAR of other hotels (excluding the motel) developed in Redmond. The proposed Bonus Incentive Program could be used to develop hotel space beyond this FAR, up to 1.35. On sites where both hotel and other commercial uses are developed, the combined FAR of the hotel and other commercial uses would not be permitted to surpass the maximum hotel FAR and the FAR of the non-hotel commercial uses cannot surpass 0.36 (or the maximum achieved through the bonus system for non-hotel commercial uses).</p> <p>The table below contains examples of the FARs that could be applied to hotels and non-hotel commercial uses on a site not using the bonus system.</p> <table><tr><th>Use</th><th>FAR Distribution Example 1</th><th>FAR Distribution Example 2</th><th>FAR Distribution Example 3</th></tr><tr><td>Hotel</td><td>0.84</td><td>1</td><td>1.2</td></tr><tr><td>Non-Hotel Commercial (max. 0.36)</td><td>0.36</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.0</td></tr><tr><td>Total Commercial FAR (max 1.2)</td><td>1.2</td><td>1.2</td><td>1.2</td></tr></table> <p>The proposal recognizes that the commercial FAR in OV does not support hotel development in that area, whereas the Downtown commercial FAR (of 1.25) does support hotels. This proposal makes hotel development in Overlake Village more feasible.</p>	Use	FAR Distribution Example 1	FAR Distribution Example 2	FAR Distribution Example 3	Hotel	0.84	1	1.2	Non-Hotel Commercial (max. 0.36)	0.36	0.2	0.0	Total Commercial FAR (max 1.2)	1.2	1.2	1.2	
Use	FAR Distribution Example 1	FAR Distribution Example 2	FAR Distribution Example 3															
Hotel	0.84	1	1.2															
Non-Hotel Commercial (max. 0.36)	0.36	0.2	0.0															
Total Commercial FAR (max 1.2)	1.2	1.2	1.2															

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>If a developer of a larger site were to parcel off a property to use the maximum allowed hotel and non-hotel commercial on each parcel respectively, this would result in less overall commercial development than if the developer used a total FAR of 1.2 on the single site, split in some fashion between the hotel and non-hotel commercial uses. Staff provided an example at the Commission's August 22 meeting.</p> <p>Few unintended consequences or negative results have been identified as potentially resulting from this proposal. The proposal would not adversely impact achievement of the goals for Overlake Village as the minimum residential requirement would apply to sites where hotels are proposed, with the exception of the Azteca site north of SR 520. Based on information provided by Austin Khan from OTO Development, staff does not believe that "too many" hotels would be built in Overlake Village due to this proposal.</p> <p>Staff does not recommend applying the higher hotel FAR to the Overlake Design District due to the amount of floor area that is already possible in this location under the proposed updates.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners expressed support for the proposal, reasoning that the current FAR in Overlake doesn't support hotel development and is much lower than the Downtown FAR. The Commissioners also considered the potential for unintended consequences that might result from increasing the FAR for hotels in Overlake Village. The Commissioners were comfortable that the proposal would not adversely impact achievement of the goals for Overlake Village and supported the approach recommended by staff.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the higher hotel FAR applies only to the Overlake Village zone, not also to the Overlake Design District. They</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>reasoned that the maximum FAR of 1.0 allowed through the bonus incentive program in the Design District is high enough to provide flexibility to create a successful development on the site and that there are a number of differences between the Design District and Overlake Village zones thus not necessitating that this provision apply to both.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u>  Austin Khan suggested that applying such an FAR to a hotel use in the RC zone would result in a lesser or similar level of transportation impacts as a neighborhood retail or service use developed at the currently allowed FAR in the RC zone. Received one citizen letter objecting to a hotel in this location.</p> <p>Austin Khan provided information on the hotel market in Overlake and other considerations hoteliers take into account when developing hotels, such as site shape and visibility, and economics. He estimated that the hotel market could accommodate 1-3 hotels in Overlake Village over the next 3-5 years. He estimated that it would not be economical to build a hotel of less than 85,000 square feet.</p> <p>Group Health representatives requested that the higher hotel FAR also be applied in the Overlake Design District stating that allowing the higher FAR in the Overlake Village zone only gives a distinct advantage to those sites for hotel development.</p>	
R3. What is the difference between “moderate intensity” (new N-OV-68) and “higher intensity” (new N-OV-69)? (Petitpas)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u>  Moderate intensity is generally described by regulations contained in the proposed site requirements chart, such as allowed FAR, allowed height, building set-backs, etc. While “higher intensity” uses are not generally described in the site requirements chart or in other places in the proposed Overlake regulations, this policy provides guidance for supporting and encouraging transit supportive development near the existing transit station at NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street.</p>	Closed.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Supported policies as proposed. Consider whether additional definition is needed as part of review of regulations. The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>R4. Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Map (Overlake Master Plan, page 24) (Microsoft, 6/13/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Private, low volume streets will not need the addition of separate bicycle lanes; rather, what is needed is through access for pedestrians and bicyclists between key locations. Regarding indemnification, the City Attorney noted that RCW 4.24.210, known as the recreational user's statute, holds property owners free of liability except when there is a known, clearly dangerous manmade condition for which warning signs have not been conspicuously posted.</p> <p>Microsoft expressed continued concern about the proposed bicycle access north of NE 51<sup>st</sup> Street for a variety of reasons, including grade, issues with accessing the SR 520 bike trail, and liability. They propose that the primary connection to the SR 520 trail be shown on NE 51<sup>st</sup> and indicated they would support enhancements along NE 51<sup>st</sup> as needed to support this access. Staff supports this change. Staff will continue to work in the future with Microsoft on liability issues related to non-motorized connections shown on the main campus between 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 30<sup>th</sup> Street.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners supported the change to show the primary connection to the SR 520 trail on NE 51<sup>st</sup> Street.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Seeking indemnification to Microsoft for pedestrian and bicyclist access through Main Campus along roughly NE 31<sup>st</sup> Street, and along the south</p>	<p>Closed with change to Overlake Master Plan.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>side of the Red-West Campus. Also noted concern about similar concept for former Nintendo property. Also noted that some of these streets are private and were not built to accommodate bike lanes.</p> <p>Microsoft is satisfied with staff's proposed update to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Map for NE 51<sup>st</sup> and sees the non-motorized connection shown on the main campus between 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 30<sup>th</sup> Street as a benefit for employees.</p>	
<p>R5.Section 20C.45.40-050, Height Limit Overlay (Microsoft, 6/13/07)</p> <p>What is the rationale for the height limit overlay? (Petitpas, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The Height Limit Overlay was created as a method of protecting neighboring residential uses; it is a requirement of the transition overlay in those commercial areas bordering lower intensity residential uses. The purpose of this section of the code is to allow the Design Review Board to consider alternatives to a height limit alone in order to provide transitions to lower height residential zones. The language is similar to the existing regulations. In response to Microsoft's comment, staff will propose revisions to the section to clarify the intent and provide additional guidance.</p> <p>Staff proposed revisions to this section of the code in response to public comment. In addition, the proposed code (page A2-16, height trade-offs) includes the same provision which was recently adopted in the Downtown which would allow square footage impacted by the height limit to be moved to another part of the site, allowing those buildings using the square footage and outside of the overlay to exceed the height limitation by up to 1 story.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners supported the staff recommended revisions.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Seeking allowance for combination of strategies including distance, landscaping and berming rather than distance alone to accomplish the</p>	<p>Closed with change to proposed regulations.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>goal of protecting adjoining single-family neighborhoods. Also concerned about the loss of development capacity due to the height limit which extends 300 feet deep into the property and seeking decision from the Design Review Board at the pre-application meeting regarding whether or not to allow proposed alternative.</p> <p>Microsoft representatives have indicated general support for the approach recommended by staff.</p>	
<p>R6. Proposed changes to permitted uses. (Snodgrass, 6/20/07; Petitpas, Querry, 6/27/07)</p> <p>Are convenience commercial and retail uses allowed in OV zone? Should similar text to OBAT zone be added regarding these uses to OV zone? (Petitpas, 6/27/07)</p> <p>Is daycare considered a convenience commercial use? (Hinman, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>Convenience commercial and retail uses, including daycare, are allowed in the OV zone and are covered by the General Retail Uses and General Service Uses definitions on page A2-5. The Convenience Retail and Service Uses section is proposed for the OBAT zone because these uses are not otherwise allowed in that zone.</p> <p>Per discussion under issue R-1, staff has proposed revisions to the use chart to clarify that convenience uses are allowed in Overlake Village.</p> <p>Staff's proposed updates to the permitted use chart incorporate the general use definitions as part of the chart rather than definitions that precede the chart, clarify that convenience uses are allowed in the Overlake Village District, clarify that contractors serving the general public would be permitted in the Overlake Village District, separate public facilities (such as a library) vs. local utilities (such as a water storage tank) for purposes of the height limit and permit process, and cover vehicles sales and rental with the general provision for retail and service categories which would not permit outdoor storage and display. For background, there is one used car dealership in Overlake Village now that would become legal non-conforming if the proposed updates are adopted, meaning that the use could continue but not expand.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the updates made to the permitted use</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>chart addressed the concerns raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>R7.Discuss Site Requirements table, footnotes, and interactions with the Bonus Incentive Program. (Petitpas, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner Petitpas stated that her concerns regarding this issue had been addressed through other conversations during the course of the Commission’s review.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>R8.Discuss the pedestrian circulation system: Can it be more clearly defined? Should TMP standards be referenced? Clarify connections to neighboring uses. Are urban pathway standards appropriate? (Petitpas, 6/27/07)</p> <p>Is “urban pathway” a standard term? What are the standards related to it? (Hinman, 6/27/07)</p> <p>In what order are pedestrian and roadway projects funded? (Parnell, 8/1/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>The Urban Pathways described in the proposed update were inspired by the mid-block paths in Downtown. The proposed design standards and street cross-sections provide sufficient standards for their development and are similar to the requirements for mid-block paths in the Downtown and are based on the Transportation Master Plan.</p> <p>Staff recommends retaining the requirement that speaks to pedestrian connections to adjacent properties. A key goal for Overlake is to improve pedestrian access and circulation and connections between properties supports that goal. This is an adopted standard and includes an alternative approach when it is not possible to determine the likely location for connections. The proposed Administrative Design Flexibility provisions (page A2-23) provide additional opportunities for alternative solutions when needed.</p> <p>Transportation projects that meet multiple needs, such as those that provide vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, may score as a higher priority for funding.</p>	<p>Closed pending review of language for Master Plan</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners discussed whether priority should be given in some way to those urban pathways that connect to transit stations or 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. They agreed that language identifying those particular connections as highest priorities could be added to the Master Plan and Implementation Strategy document but noted that this language would not place these projects on the TFP.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>R9. Are ground floor use regulations consistent with those for the Downtown? Are there any examples of buildings in Downtown built or designed to the new regulations? (Petitpas, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The ground floor use regulations are generally consistent with those adopted for the Downtown. In both locations, the regulations indicate major streets where commercial or other nonresidential uses are required due either to the desired character of the street or to concerns for potential adverse impacts on ground floor housing. The proposed Overlake regulations would require pedestrian oriented uses along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, while allowing up to 50% of the frontage to be designed and constructed for conversion to these types of uses in the future.</p> <p>A number of new applications have come in recently for projects in the Downtown. None of these projects have opted to put in ground floor residential units and one project is proposing an office use on the ground floor. None of these projects has yet reached the construction stage.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>R10. Discuss Proposed Bonus Incentive Program (several, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> There is no distinction or hierarchy between plazas, open spaces or</p>	<p>Closed with revision to code.</p>



**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>aRegarding Priority Bonus Feature 2: should we require a minimum size for a plaza or park? (Petitpas, 6/27/07)</p> <p>bIs there a distinction between plazas, open spaces, or parks? Is there a hierarchy? (Hinman, 6/27/07)</p> <p>cHow many sites in Overlake Village would be subject to the Master Planning requirement? (Hinman, 6/27/07)</p> <p>dIn the Additional Bonus Features, do any of the incentives bias developers towards having more buildings on site? (Hinman, 6/27/07)</p> <p>eWhat is the possibility for administrative flexibility in the bonus program to grant incentives for public goods or other features that have not yet been envisioned? (Parnell, 6/27/07)</p>	<p>parks. Staff will revise regulations to use only 1 term.</p> <p>Approximately 6 sites in Overlake Village would be subject to the Master Planning requirement, Priority Bonus 3.</p> <p>Staff does not believe that any of the incentives would bias developers towards having more buildings on a site. There are a number of development regulations that apply to sites, including building separation, minimum landscaping/open space requirements, and others that would apply. The benefit of the extra height that could be achieved is likely offset by the cost of construction.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the bonus incentive program begin by focusing on a shorter list of priorities to focus resources. As amenities are provided in the neighborhood, the bonus incentive program could be revisited and new public goods or features could be added.</p> <p>Staff recommends the following two clarifications to the incentives section: 1) Requirements that apply to all developments such as a minimum amount of residential usable open space, may not be met through bonus features, such as a park or plaza, provided through the incentive program. The incentive program is intended to encourage applicants to exceed standard requirements through the opportunity for additional height, floor area or uses beyond the “of-right” standards. Open spaces can be combined to create a space of greater value but both the base standards and provisions of the incentive program would need to be met, and 2) TDRs may not be used to exceed the maximum height allowed through the incentive program.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that requirements described for plazas provided as part of Priority Bonus 2 are sufficient enough to not necessitate a minimum size requirement. Agreed that Priority Bonus 3</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>should only apply to redevelopment of qualifying sites, not to modifications of existing structures on those sites. Agreed that Council should approve the master plans with review by Technical Committee and Design Review Board. The Commission agreed that the information provided addressed the concerns raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>R11. Discuss parking garage design regulations. Are these consistent with those for the Downtown, particularly with regard to the BNSF corridor? (Petitpas, Querry, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The proposed parking garage design regulations are consistent with those for the Downtown, including those for properties along the BNSF corridor. The proposed parking garage design regulations for Overlake offer additional detail and clarification on parking garage design over the Downtown regulations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>R12. Could buildings along SR 520 be allowed additional height to serve as a buffer or screen of the freeway for the rest of Overlake Village? (Parnell, 6/27/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The PS Business Park site is the primary property within Overlake Village which abuts SR 520. As this site is a location for one of the two regional stormwater management facilities called for in the proposed bonus incentive program, buildings on this site could reach up to 9 stories in height. Placing these buildings back from 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE would locate them closer to SR 520 allowing them to serve as a buffer or screen.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Public Comments (if any)</u>	
R13. Building Form and Scale, Section 20D.40.200-040	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u>  Staff has further evaluated the proposed standards in this section and recommends revisions in order to: 1) clarify the purpose (maintain light to dwellings in tall residential buildings), 2) avoid design issues experienced in the Downtown (enclosed courtyards without adequate light), 3) correct an inconsistency in the proposed modulation standard, 4) provide several alternative ways to meet the design standards, and 5) maintain the same maximum height (6 stories) within 50 feet of 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and Bel-Red Road (north of NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street) for properties south of the Group Health site as is proposed in the amendment for the Group Health site. Staff recommends that buildings taller than 6 stories not be allowed at the street edge in these locations since they have the highest elevations in the area.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>  The Commission supported the proposed design standards related to building step back and height limit along 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE and on higher elevations, design of large buildings, and modulation.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the proposed standards related to light for residential dwellings and courtyards in buildings over 6 stories. A number of the Commissioners expressed concern that the proposed standards were too prescriptive and could drive up costs of housing in Overlake Village. One Commissioner questioned whether there was a policy basis for the proposed standards. The Commissioners suggested revisions to the standard that would express intent but not regulate how buildings achieve the intent. The suggested revision was supported by all but one Commissioner who reasoned that the proposed requirements provided more of a guarantee that enclosed courtyards and other open spaces would be useable and inviting to residents.</p>	Closed with revisions to code.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Public Comments (if any)</u>	
<b>Group Health Request</b>		
G1.How does the Group Health proposal address the water storage tank and electrical substation needs discussed in the staff report? (Parnell, 7/25/07)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The Group Health site is among the locations that could provide the elevation desired for a water storage tank. However, locating a water storage tank on this property would reduce the redevelopment capacity of the site. Alternative locations and analysis for a water storage tank will be further evaluated as part of the City's upcoming update to its water system plan. The City Public Works Department is planning to have a consultant under contract to begin the Water System Plan update by September or October 2007. The Plan update is anticipated to be complete by January 2009.</p> <p>The placement of an electrical substation with above-ground transmission lines on this property is in greater conflict with the redevelopment of the site as a compact, mixed-use place than the placement of a water storage tank.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Group Health acknowledged the need for public facilities in the Overlake Neighborhood and echoed the staff recommendation regarding the placement of either of these facilities on their site.</p>	Closed.
G2.How would tree savings be coordinated with open spaces? (Parnell, 7/25/07)	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff supports the approach outlined by Group Health representatives below.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p>	Closed with update to Group Health proposal language.

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Commissioners noted that removing some trees from a site but leaving others can result in making the retained trees more vulnerable. The Commission suggested that survival of retained trees be considered in site planning. The Commission requested adding language regarding the “consideration of wind patterns” to the tree retention-related portion of the Group Health amendment proposal.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>Group Health representatives noted that open spaces on the site could be designed in ways and in places to conserve stands of significant trees while ensuring there is a balance of open lawn and treed areas.</p>	
<p>G3.Discuss proposed height limits and associated issues (several, 7/25/07)</p> <p>How is tree conservation related to allowance of additional height? (Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p> <p>At what point do retained trees become insignificant in terms of relative size compared to building height? (Parnell, 7/25/07)</p> <p>What is the relationship between open space and taller buildings on the site? (Several, 7/25/07)</p> <p>How can we ensure that a 12 story residential building will be the same height as a 9 story commercial building? (McCarthy, 7/25/07)</p> <p>Should height be restricted in another</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>Staff recommends limiting the height in feet of 12 story buildings to ensure they are the same height as a 9 story commercial building. This also provides an additional way of restricting height on the property. Staff does not see that allowing commercial buildings to go to 10 stories within the proposed height limit of 126 feet (as proposed by Commissioners) would affect the BROTS cap, job targets or transportation analysis since the proposed amendment includes a maximum commercial floor area ratio for the entire site which would apply. Allowing the additional floor could result in less building footprint on the site overall. Staff recommends that the bonus incentive program be used to achieve a 10<sup>th</sup> floor, rather than allowing it as a “freebie” if the developer achieves 9 stories.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the Master Plan process include a light and shadow study as part of a required height and bulk study. The completion of such studies would result in meaningful review of taller buildings during the Master Plan review stage.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>A majority of the Commissioners expressed their support for the proposal to allow residential buildings and a hotel up to 12 stories on</p>	<p>Closed with updates to code.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>way, in addition to or in place of, stories? (Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p> <p>How will light and shadow issues related to taller buildings be addressed? (Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p> <p>Under what circumstances would a 12-story building be acceptable? (Querry, 7/25/07)</p> <p>Will there be meaningful review of taller buildings at the Master Plan review stage? (Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p>	<p>this site in return for substantial community benefits, including a park, tree conservation, and a timeless design. Some Commissioners expressed hesitation and requested additional information.</p> <p>Commissioners supporting additional height commented that Overlake is the location in Redmond where taller buildings are most appropriate and that taller buildings could help define the character of Overlake which seems to be creating its own character through innovations. In addition, Commissioners supporting additional height expressed comfort with buildings being slightly taller than the existing trees on site. Further, they noted that the site's proximity to existing and future transit is a benefit in two respects: the transit will help support the increased density and the increased density will help support the transit.</p> <p>The Commissioners suggested several additional or different means of regulating height including an elevation (plane) limit, define by number of feet, restrict the location where taller buildings could be located, or through design principles that might guide review during the Master Plan process.</p> <p>The Commissioners noted that the topography and orientation of the site could help to reduce some effects of light and shadow from taller buildings. The Commission agreed to add "height and bulk study that addresses building height and shadow" to the Master Planning requirement in the proposed bonus incentive program.</p> <p>The Commissioners commented that the Group Health site is different from others in Redmond and presents a good opportunity for increased building height. Regarding the revised Group Health proposal, which includes a maximum height in feet as well as stories for residential and hotel buildings, the Commission discussed establishing a maximum height in feet for commercial buildings and allowing up to 10 floors. A benefit of this approach is that it would give developers more flexibility in the number of floors for office buildings. A concern related to this</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>approach is how it might affect density, the relationship to the BROTS cap, and the impact on our adopted jobs/housing targets.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the bonus incentive program must be used to achieve a 10<sup>th</sup> floor in a commercial building, up to 126 feet. They reasoned that this is consistent with the administration of the program, that it promotes more use of the program, and that it encourages smaller building footprints.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>Representatives of Group Health introduced their proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Guide, providing background on the proposed amendment and how the proposed updates are tailored to the attributes of the 28-acre Group Health site.</p> <p>Written comment for public hearing included support for taller buildings to free up space for parks and traffic solutions; taller buildings should have multi-story parking structures. (Patrick and Fay Cawley) Another resident supported use of the Group Health site for a natural park retaining existing landscaping and providing space for a community center (Herb Bentley). See also public comment under Issue S-1.</p> <p>Group Health representatives suggested that additional tree conservation may be possible given the allowance of additional height because it enables a building's footprint to shrink in size.</p> <p>Group Health representatives support the staff recommendation to require a height and bulk study, with a light and shading component, as part of the Master Plan process.</p> <p>Group Health representatives support the staff recommendation to restrict the height in feet of 12 story buildings to ensure that they are</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>relatively the same height as 9 story commercial buildings. They propose that 12 story residential buildings not exceed 125 feet and that 12 story hotel buildings not exceed 135 feet, which gives some additional flexibility for the development of a hotel. This height limitation serves as an additional restriction on height on the site.</p> <p>Group Health supports the Commission’s suggestion to regulate height on the site in feet as well. Group Health representatives pointed out that this would not allow for an increase in allowed FAR on the site, so total additional floor area would not result. Instead, this may allow for fewer buildings to be built on the site potentially resulting in increased open space or tree conservation.</p> <p>Group Health representatives requested clarification on whether the bonus incentive program must be used to achieve a 10<sup>th</sup> floor in a commercial building that is no more than 126 feet in height. Their impression from the previous Planning Commission meeting was that the critical issue is to not exceed the height limit in feet, not the number of stories built within that height limit. This would indicate there is not a requirement to provide a bonus item to “earn” the 10<sup>th</sup> floor.</p>	
<p>G4.Does the park space provided for the bonus incentive system count toward the required minimum landscaped area? (Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p> <p>If yes, why would park space merit a bonus if the landscaped area is already required? (Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p> <p>If yes, would the hardscaped portions of the park space count towards the required minimum landscaped area?</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>Currently, the required minimum landscaping on a site can be provided in a number of ways, including in the setback. A benefit to allowing the park space provided for the bonus incentive system to count toward the required minimum landscaped area is that it ensures that some amount of the minimum landscaped area is usable by the public by defining its size, location, function, and accessibility.</p> <p>As set out in the RCDG (20A.20.120: Definitions), the definition of “landscaped area” is as follows:</p> <p><i>All portions of a site not devoted to building, parking, storage or accessory use are referred to as the landscape area. A landscape area may include patios, plazas, walkways, walls and fences, water</i></p>	<p>Closed with updates to Group Health proposal language.</p>



**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>(Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p> <p>What is the definition of “landscaped area?” (Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p>	<p><i>features such as a fountain or pool, and planting areas. Ponds for the detention of storm water runoff are not considered part of the landscape area of a site, unless they are integrated with landscaping as a water feature.</i></p> <p>Given this definition of “landscape area,” the hardscaped portions of the park space would count towards the required minimum landscaped area.</p> <p>After reviewing the code, staff found that the park space provided as an amenity on the site would count towards the required minimum landscaped area. Up to 25% of the required minimum landscaped area could be hardscaped. In addition to meeting the minimum landscaped area requirement, the development would also need to meet other specific landscape standards such as those for surface parking lots, buffers, and significant site features such as building and site entrances. Landscaping provided to meet these other specific landscape standards can be counted towards the required minimum landscaped area, provided these areas meet certain requirements, including minimum dimension requirements. Staff recommends adding to the proposed landscape section for Overlake (20C.45.40-040, page A2-15) a clarification that building and site entrances and similar significant site features are required to be landscaped.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>Some of the Commissioners expressed concern with the amount of hardscape that could result on this hillside and the aesthetic and environmental impacts of such development. They recommended adding language to the proposal to “consider (or encourage) the use of permeable pavement and other environmentally friendly materials” in the site development. Pending this addition, the Commission agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>Group Health representatives clarified that their proposal assumes that</p>	

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>the park space would count towards the required minimum landscaped area and that the park space would include a mix of hardscaped and green areas.</p> <p>Group Health supported the suggested addition of language regarding permeable pavement with the condition that the language “where possible” be added as well.</p>	
<p>G5.How would the development of the park be phased? Would the Parks Board be involved in master planning of this park? (Hinman, Snodgrass, 7/25/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>The Parks Board would be involved in master planning of this park as it would either be dedicated to the City of Redmond by the developer or would be subject to mutually-agreed-upon covenants.</p> <p>Staff recommends adding a requirement that the phasing of parks, open space and any cultural facilities be identified during the Master Plan process. Staff proposes the following language be added to Priority Bonus Feature 1:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The City and applicant shall establish an agreement regarding the design, funding and timing for completion of improvements for this park. The completion of improvements for this park shall be commensurate with the <u>progress on the</u> construction of the development.</p> <p>Staff proposes that similar language also be added to Priority Bonus Feature 3 (Master Plan) so that it applies to any amenities provided on a site as well as affordable housing components.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners noted that providing the park sooner during the development of the site would be better than later in the development and would help to clarify to the public why the developer was granted a bonus in height and/or floor area. The Commissioners suggested that the timing of the park should be considered by the Technical Committee when determining whether or not to grant the bonus.</p>	<p>Closed with revision to language.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The Commissioners supported the language proposed by staff above, with a revision (shown above in underline). The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Group Health supports the proposed staff/Planning Commission revisions to the Priority Bonus language.</p>	
<p>G6.How do we strike a balance between flexibility (not too much regulation) and certainty (avoid creating too many exceptions)? (Querry, 7/25/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> In general, staff believes that Group Health’s proposal represents a balance between certainty for the public and flexibility for the property owner. Staff and Group Health representatives have worked closely over the last year in the preparation of this proposal and have reached agreement on a majority of items.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners concurred and agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>G7.Does a hotel on this site create any special economic benefit for the City? (Hinman, 7/25/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> At this time, no unique economic benefit to the City has been identified as coming from a hotel on this site. Staff has heard anecdotally that there is a large demand on the Eastside for hotel rooms and a hotel in this location could help meet some of that demand. A hotel could also help support City goals related to tourism.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the question raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>G8.Group Health proposed Parking Structure Bonus and differences with City-proposed Parking Structure Bonus (Additional Bonus Feature 3 in both proposals): Should above-grade, wrapped parking be treated the same as below-grade parking?</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Group Health has proposed a slightly different parking structure bonus than that proposed in the City-initiated proposal. The Group Health proposal would provide the same bonus for above-grade, wrapped parking as for below-grade parking. The City-initiated proposal grants less of a bonus for above-grade, wrapped parking than for below-grade parking.</p> <p>Staff recommends that the bonuses awarded (one additional floor, additional commercial FAR, additional residential FAR, and additional uses) to a developer for having 60% of a site's parking located below grade be maintained due to the relatively higher cost incurred in providing this type of parking. Staff recommends that if 60% of a site's parking is provided as a combination of below-grade and structured wrapped parking (where otherwise not required), that a developer be able to choose one of the above bonuses that is awarded for the 60% below-grade parking provision.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commission expressed a concern regarding how this bonus might be achieved if there were a mix of below-grade and structured wrapped parking on site and recommended that staff clarify the bonus language. Pending revisions to the language, the Commissioners supported this approach.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u> Group Health noted support for the staff recommendation.</p>	<p>Closed pending bonus language revisions.</p>
<p>G9.INFORMATION REQUESTS</p> <p>What will the taller buildings look like from vantage points at a distance from the site, such as SR 520?</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commission agreed that the visual information presented by Group Health during the 8/15/07 meeting addressed the questions raised. The</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>(Query, 7/25/07)</p> <p>What will the taller buildings look like relative to what exists on the site today? (Query, 7/25/07)</p> <p>Will taller buildings on the site be visible from Downtown Redmond? (Parnell, 7/25/07)</p>	<p>information was helpful to the Commission in understanding how taller buildings on the Group Health site might look from places in Overlake Village. The Commission noted that taller buildings on this site would likely not be visible in Downtown Redmond.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p> <p>Group Health provided a number of images to the Planning Commission in the form of a slide show. Representatives had taken photos of the existing site from various vantage points throughout the Overlake Village area and then showed what the view would be of the potential development.</p>	
<b>Evaluation/SEIS</b>		
<p>E1. Consider environmental, transportation and economic impacts and performance measures. (8/30/06 - several)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u></p> <p>The Draft SEIS published March 23, 2007 includes analysis of environmental and transportation impacts of the No Action and Action Alternatives on the Overlake Neighborhood. Performance measures are included in the transportation analysis section of this document. The proposed plan is based on a strategy of implementing needed improvements over time through a combination of public and private investments. As part of the plan development, staff worked with a consultant on general cost estimates for the regional stormwater management facilities, has met with Park staff and the Park Board regarding potential funding for park improvements, and has worked with a consultant to prepare cost estimates for each of the proposed transportation improvements. Similar to previous transportation planning work, the outcome of this process will be an amendment to the City's Transportation Master Plan to add the final list of proposed transportation projects to either the 20-year or build-out plan and to update the revenue forecast.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that they expect to continue to address these issues through discussions on various portions of the proposed</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>amendment.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>E2. Consider park/open space needs associated with potential growth and how this fits with City LOS standards for parks. (8/30/06 – several)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u>  Park and open space needs are provided for in the Draft Overlake Master Plan and Implementation Strategy, policies, and regulations. The proposed park and open space system identified for the Overlake Village area helps the neighborhood to better meet the City parks LOS standards. The City parks LOS standards are applied on a city-wide basis and do not require that parks needs for residents of one neighborhood be met entirely within that neighborhood.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>  The Commissioners noted that Overlake warrants more parks and open spaces. They further agreed that they expect to continue to address this issue through discussions on the Master Plan and Implementation Strategy.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u>  Two written comments for public hearing supported adding green space, providing a central gathering place, adding a community center for teens and young adults. (Herb Bentley, Patrick and Fay Cawley)</p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>E3. The Draft SEIS does not seem to address the location or footprint of a future water storage tank in the Overlake Neighborhood. (Hinman, Email 6/7/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u>  The Draft SEIS acknowledges the future need for additional water storage capacity within the Overlake/Viewpoint water service area. The water storage tank is primarily needed to provide additional standby storage that would serve the Overlake/Viewpoint service area and the City. A water storage tank is ideally located at the highest elevation in its service area in order to use gravity for distribution; the area in the vicinity of 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 28<sup>th</sup> Street is the highest elevation in the Overlake Neighborhood. A tank would be approximately 130 feet in height and would need a site of approximately 1.4 acres in size.</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The proposed development regulations for Overlake would allow utilities over 40 feet in height as a Conditional Use, requiring approval of the City Council. No provisions within either the Overlake Neighborhood Plan or Group Health proposals would prevent a water tank from locating within the neighborhood.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Acknowledged during review of environmental summary.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>E4. Statement that the Viewpoint neighborhood should have been involved (noticed) in this process. Concern that transportation analysis did not evaluate impacts to Viewpoint Neighborhood. (Carol Helland, Viewpoint resident; Public Hearing 5/30/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> A separate planning process is underway for the Viewpoint neighborhood. Information on the status of the Overlake planning process has been provided to the potential Viewpoint Citizens Advisory Committee members; they were invited to participate in the public hearing and to share information with their neighbors. Information on the status of both the Overlake and Viewpoint planning processes was mailed to all residents of Viewpoint and the Overlake Residential Area in August 2007.</p> <p>Staff took into consideration the 1999 Overlake EIS in determining the area for transportation analysis and property specific notice for the current update. Same as the 1999 EIS, the transportation analysis for the current update did not extend into Viewpoint but focused on areas of greatest anticipated potential impact. Throughout the process, staff provided property specific notice to addresses within the Overlake study area and Grass Lawn neighborhood due to anticipation of greatest potential impact to these areas. This notice was supplemented using a number of other techniques, including community wide notice via periodic articles in the Redmond Reporter, Focus Magazine, the web,</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>use of RCTV and an initial mailing to 400 individuals who have expressed interest in Redmond planning issues. The transportation modeling in the Final SEIS includes analysis of traffic impacts at 3 intersections in or near the Viewpoint Neighborhood.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners acknowledged the response and closed this issue.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>E5. Concern that the financing plan for infrastructure improvements should be in place before decisions are made on proposed updates. (Carol Helland, Viewpoint resident, Public Hearing, 5/30/07)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The updates under consideration as part of Phase 1 of the Overlake Neighborhood Plan update do not create additional capacity for residential or commercial development in Overlake. This process has identified the general infrastructure needs of Overlake for the future; development of such infrastructure will generally keep pace with private development. The City is not required to build infrastructure in advance of the potential development that could occur.</p> <p>An initial review of the projects listed in the Proposed Transportation Actions list shows that nearly half of them are either funded, contained in existing plans, or would be funded through private development. An additional one-fifth of the projects would be addressed regionally.</p> <p>Following Phase 1 of this project, updates to functional plans—including the General Sewer Plan, Water System Plan, Transportation Master Plan, and PRO Plan—will be completed. Financing will be addressed as part of these plan updates or as work following these plan updates.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the concern raised.</p>	<p>Closed.</p>



**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues  
Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and Implementation**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Public Comments (if any)</u>	
<b>Info Requests</b>		
1. Photos of parking lot redevelopment and LRT stations.	<u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u>  <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that photos of parking lot redevelopment and light rail stations were unnecessary.  <u>Public Comments (if any)</u>	Closed.
2. Info on travel patterns of Microsoft employees, including by mode if possible.	<u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Information from 2006 Microsoft and CTR surveys has been analyzed. This analysis was provided in a separate document.  <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the request.  <u>Public Comments (if any)</u>	Closed.

N:\Bel-Red Planning\Correspondence\City Council\PC Report Attachments\PC Discussion Issues.doc